



National Helpline Number:

01217478100

Address:

HolidayTravelWatch
PO Box 12768
Birmingham. B28 1AQ

www.holidaytravelwatch.com

Key Travel Tips:

- Always demand sight of a travel providers terms and conditions before you book. Never book any travel without reading the small print!
- When booking online, always read the small print - do not be tempted to simply 'tick' the box stating that you have read those terms and conditions
- When traveling abroad with credit cards, make a separate record of card numbers, just in case you lose them

Inside this issue:

To Package or Not to Package? Where Now?	2
Are you ready for Court?	3
The HolidayTravel-Watch Clinic	4
Carbon Monoxide in the Air?	5
Carbon Monoxide in the Air?	6
Significant Alteration to Essential Terms 2	6
Destroyed, Lost & Delayed Baggage Rights	7
How Ethical is Your Travel?	7
End-Notes	8

May 2007

Issue 4

The Urgent Question of Standards

The tragic 2006 Corfu Carbon Monoxide deaths, recently featured on the BBC Panorama programme. The programme provided an insight into the experience of the family, the nature of the problem that led to the deaths of two children, and the response of the tour operator. Not surprisingly, the family expressed their views on what had happened to their children, and where they thought the responsibility lay. The tour operator was unhappy with the format of the programme, and it appears that their complaints may be the basis for further action. HolidayTravelWatch has consistently called for a safe uniform standard, to be imported

into all holiday contracts. The basis of its call is enshrined within the Package Travel Regulations. We believe that clear consumer protections, lead to a clear contractual relationship between the travel consumer and travel provider alike. The Corfu program only confirms what we already know. Many holiday-makers within their holiday contracts, is it right therefore that those rights should now be diluted because of some legal sophistry? How many Corfu tragedies must take place before action is taken? Politicians must act now, not abdicate their responsibility to the travel consumer!



Support the Campaign!

Sign the Petition!



A Better Deal for Travel Insurance?

Toward the end of 2006, HolidayTravelWatch was called to give evidence to the Treasury Select Committee, on whether the travel consumer suffered detriment, when they purchased travel insurance from a travel agent or tour operator. We provided ample evidence within our initial report, of how the travel

insurance product actually fails the consumer. During the exchanges with the Committee, we illustrated how the consumer purchases the insurance product and how it can be potentially costly to that consumer, when things go wrong. We followed up our written and oral evidence with an additional report,

highlighting the exclusions found within terms and conditions. The Committee has recommended that such sales should come under the scrutiny and monitoring of the FSA. The matter now rests with the Treasury who have to decide whether to impose full regulation on the Travel Industry, or develop a half-way regulated house.

To Package or Not to Package? What Now?



“We take the view that these efforts amount to nothing more than legal trickery, it is a major con-trick being visited upon the average travel consumer”

Since 2005, HolidayTravel-Watch has reported on the threat to the travel consumer, through the internet sale of holidays, and the ABTA v CAA dispute over ATOL licences. It is as well to remember that the original dispute surrounded the creation of a guidance note by the CAA, which would have required agents selling component package holidays, to carry an ATOL licence. Understandably, the Travel Industry was concerned that they were being subjected to a ruling, which would not have been applied to low cost airlines. They considered that the result would be to create a two tier system of regulation. ABTA decided to challenge the CAA. ABTA supporters make the point that they simply set out to challenge the validity of a ‘guidance note’, nothing more. However an examination of the case, reveals that the arguments made, cut to the very heart of what constitutes a ‘package holiday’. The definition used by the ATOL regulations, closely mirror that which is found within the Package Travel Regulations. However, when the Regulations were being drafted, they included a section which anticipated the growth of internet selling. For example, it held that the ‘splitting’ of a package holiday, or the provision of separate invoices, would still amount to a package holiday. Was the Court of Appeal persuaded by an earlier, perhaps more simplistic argument, that the purchasing of components was akin to buying the weekly shop at your local supermarket.

We commented following the decision that whilst the decision was bad news for holidaymakers, it was actually worse news for the Travel Industry as a whole. Despite their protestations that the challenge was all about a ‘note’, the Industry was disappointed that the decision on what constitutes a ‘package’ did not go far enough. Perhaps their Lordships realised that this would have been a step too far, usurping the will of Parliament and the Council of Ministers? The Travel Industry is now embarked upon a feeding frenzy of ‘restructure’ with the rallying cry of ‘Agent or Principal’. A principal would say, ‘we are organising everything in your holiday, and therefore, if anything goes wrong we are responsible’. This is to be compared to the role of an agent, this can be summarised thus, ‘we do not organise the holiday, we simply arrange everything on your behalf with suppliers, if anything goes wrong, the suppliers are responsible’. The Travel Industry hold the view that, Regulation 2 of the Package Travel Regulations, represents a position which is now outdated; the correct view is that expressed by the CAA decision. By following the latter route it creates the opportunity for the Travel Industry to ‘restructure’ and copy the business models created by the low cost airlines. By doing so, and therefore re-creating themselves as ‘agents’, tour operators can re-form themselves into a new legal entity; an entity without responsibility, an entity that does not have to comply with

either ATOL or Package Travel Regulation responsibilities. Some in the Industry suggest that they should no longer use the ‘P’ word when describing their product, hardly an ethical method to try and evade their wider responsibilities! We take the view that these efforts amount to nothing more than legal trickery, it is a major con-trick being visited upon the average travel consumer. Open Markets? Wider Choice for the Consumer? Does the ‘click n’go’ mentality truly provide the necessary guarantor to individual rights in contract? HolidayTravel-Watch consistently receives reports from holidaymakers with disputes in contract, holiday illness or injury. There is a growing proportion who have fallen victim to the ‘deconstructed package’ sale; they now find themselves subjected to poor standards, and in some cases, a non-existent standard. The front page of our Travel-Zine, highlights the underlying threat to holidaymakers in holiday contracts. The Government appears to sit on its hands, and does nothing to protect the travel consumer whilst the Travel Industry is becoming cautiously emboldened. We have already begun the 2007 holiday season, and with it, many complaints on the nature of DIY Holiday Contracts. Travel companies are already referring to some of their services within brochures as ‘agencies’. The wild west is finally upon us! Will consumers have to endure dire and sometimes dangerous conditions before someone will act?

Are you ready for Court?

The recent ABTA law conference highlighted a case, which was brought by an aggrieved holidaymaker, before the Small Claims Court.

We were told that his complaint followed on from a major incident, whereby a local dam had burst, causing extensive flooding to his hotel.

The holidaymaker, along with others, were evacuated to another hotel, which it was alleged did not warrant its star rating.

Several days later, the holidaymakers were returned to their original hotel, which was still in a state of disrepair.

The holidaymaker complained about furniture being left out to dry, and other 'fabric' problems with the hotel, along with the standard of the temporary hotel.

Unfortunately he lost his case.

It was speculated that he had failed to plead his case under Regulation 14 & 15 of the Package Travel Regulations; had he done so it was suggested, the outcome may have been different.

We cannot pass judgement on how the case was presented - we were not there. However, the fact that the Travel Industry highlighted this case raises several interesting issues.

Like many consumer organisations, we sometimes highlight the option of the Small Claims Court, as a method of resolving their claim when methods of negotiation have failed (in this case we had no role).

The Courts are generally helpful to litigants in person, but many become confused by the litigation process, and frightened by the prospect of running their own trial.

We have spoken with many such holidaymakers, who all consider that they have got themselves into something a 'little over their head'.

We think that the reason for this is that they simply do not understand the law, and how to present their case.

Why should they, after all, they did not go on holiday to deliberately start a legal action?

Many holidaymakers take this route because they believe it to be simple, and because it does not attract a risk of costs or high charges from solicitors.

When they embark on such an action, many are met with the full force of a tour operators legal department, or their retained solicitors. We suspect many give up, some come to HolidayTravelWatch for guidance on how they can deal with their court case, many are referred to lawyers for further guidance.

We are familiar with the case highlighted at ABTA; it was a case whereby we had dealt with a group of 150 complainants. The facts were simple. The hotel had been deluged by water, making it impossible to operate. All the guests were evacuated; non UK residents were provided with a choice of hotel from their tour operators brochure, the British guests were simply transported to their 'temporary hotel'. Several days later, they were returned to the original hotel. They found that British guests had already been booked into the hotel, many 'upgraded' to ground floor rooms. The hotel had suffered water damage, there were regular water and power cuts, many guests began to suffer illness and we received complaints of the

poor state of hygiene practiced at the hotel.

We were alarmed to discover that one of the pools was so full of sludge it was difficult to discern where the pool began and where it ended. We are aware of one guest who laid out sun loungers to mark the boundary of the swimming pool, to warn of its location to new guests.

How did one Organiser react to this major health and safety issue? It has been alleged that they had simply faxed a 'tick-box' questionnaire to the hotel, which was completed by the management, and then returned to the Organiser. Presumably this would be sufficient to discharge their health and safety audit?

The moral of this case is to learn from the experience of the holidaymaker,.

Before you begin any action, look at your evidence and ask, "have I got all the facts"? If you consider that they fall woefully short of a persuasive argument, do two things; firstly read the terms and conditions of your holiday contract and understand the law that governs them. Secondly, search for other people who may have stayed at your hotel, and get their agreement to share their information with you.

You should then present your evidence in a chronological form, weaving in the law, your contract, and your witness evidence. Present the evidence in a folder, with an index, and do not become phased by the Defendants terminology or presentation.

If you get into difficulty, ask a solicitor for guidance, better than wishing you had done so, when you are standing before the Judge!



“How did one Organiser react to this major health and safety issue? It has been alleged that they had simply faxed a ‘tick-box’ questionnaire to the hotel, which was completed by the management, and then returned to the Organiser. Presumably this would be sufficient to discharge their health and safety audit?”

HolidayTravelWatch Clinic™ - Case Study:



This case study involves two travel providers, and one hotel. Mr D was given a birthday surprise by his Partner, a long week-end in Rome. His Partner thought she had booked a 'Package Holiday' with Travel Provider A, arranging flights, hotel and transfers. At the time of booking, she was quoted one price, and paid, with her credit card, one price for the holiday. She was provided with one booking and one confirmation invoice. Both Mr D and his Partner set off on what they hoped would be a wonderful holiday in the Eternal City. When they arrived at the hotel, they

checked into their room and started to unpack. Within a few minutes, they were told by the hotelier that they could not stay at the hotel, it was full and they had to leave. They protested and produced their tickets and accommodation voucher. The hotelier was unrelenting, there was no room. They then had to contact Travel Provider A, who then arranged accommodation away from the centre of Rome. As a result they lost a whole day from a three day week-end, and missed many of the pre-purchased excursions they were due to take on the first day. When they returned to the UK, they discovered

that they could not simply call Travel Provider A, they had to e mail them! Travel Provider A responded that they were not responsible, if they examined the terms and conditions, they were simply acting as agents, it was Travel Provider B's responsibility. Travel Provider B responded that it was not their fault, this was a problem with the hotel, they too were only acting as an 'agent'. The Hotelier responded that it was not his fault, the problem was created by Travel Provider B!

Understandably Mr D and his Partner were both annoyed and confused, how did a 'Package Holiday' become so

“Travel Agents should be held to a duty to investigate and ascertain the reliability of suppliers, tour operators and wholesales they recommend”.

Suggested Resolution:

Mr D and his Partner have joined the ranks of a growing number of holidaymakers who have joined the 'brave new world of travel'! In order to determine the solution, you have to establish whether the company that has sold the holiday to you is an 'agent' or a 'principal'. If they were a 'principal', there is potential liability for any failings in the contract. If they are an 'agent', then their argument will point to the fact that they are acting for a 'principal'. Mr D's case is complicated because it would appear that there were two 'agents' acting for the hotelier. Travel Provider A was the initial contact

for Mr D. Travel Provider B also states that they too are acting as an 'agent' for the hotelier. Can they both be right? If you follow their argument within their terms and conditions, then probably yes! However, Regulation 2 of the Package Travel Regulations (PTR) is still in force! It is clear, the creation of a Package Holiday, either by the supplier or at the consumers request constitutes a Package and attracts the protections of the PTR. The current view of the Travel Industry is that this is incorrect, we should follow the definition of a 'Package' within R v CAA. If they are correct, then the decision in a

US case Rodriguez v Cardona Travel Bureau (1986) should follow, "Travel Agents should be held to a duty to investigate and ascertain the reliability of suppliers, tour operators and wholesales they recommend". Mr D is now faced with the difficulty of establishing which position is dominant, the rights under the PTR or the decision in R v CAA. Whatever the difficulties it is clear that one, if not both of the agents, have failed Mr D. We have recommended a close examination of the contract and thereafter a Money Claims Online application, how will the Judges decide this complex issue?

Carbon Monoxide in the Air?

HolidayTravelWatch has recently received a report from Mrs X, who claims that her family suffered illness following a flight to the United States.

They advised that they and a number of other passengers were overcome with breathing difficulties.

When they arrived at their destination, they continued to suffer with respiratory problems and stomach upsets. Since their return to the UK, they report that they still suffer with respiratory difficulties, and are continuing to receive medical assistance.

There is an automatic assumption that that the illnesses arise from something the passengers ate, but is this the correct conclusion?

For a number of years there has been a continuing debate on the quality of cabin air; is it good to recycle air, should the level of oxygen be reduced, what is the potential for pollutants to enter the air supply and what is the potential effect of any cabin toxin on the human body?

In a period when Carbon Monoxide (CO) poisoning is uppermost in the public minds, following the Corfu tragedy, we have to ask what is the potential for Carbon Monoxide to enter an aircraft cabin?

The issue of CO and aircraft appears to have been first reported in 1972. The Federal Aviation Authority provided a warning to small air-

craft users of the potential for carbon monoxide to infiltrate the cabin of piston aircraft. At that time they advised that all aircraft owners should install a CO detector, to protect the health of pilots.

How does this threat transmit itself into modern day aircraft?

The issue is clearly illustrated within the Air Accidents Investigation Branch (AAIB) report 1/2004.

Within that report they investigated an incident with a BAe 146 aircraft on approach to Birmingham International Airport in November 2000.

The flight was returning from Paris, and shortly after take off, the crew were alerted to passengers reporting an oily smell within the cabin.

Initial crew investigations found nothing unusual.

Toward the end of the flight, both pilots went to the toilet and returned to their duties. Shortly after returning to the cockpit, both crew reported that they were feeling nauseous, the First Officer suffered trembling, and was placed onto oxygen.

The Commander of the flight continued with his duties getting steadily worse, but managed to bring the aircraft safely down, disengaging the autopilot at 150 feet.

The AAIB carried out a thorough investigation on the BAe 146 and noted similar incidents with Boeing 757,

737, Fokker 100, Airbus 320/321 and DCH-8 aircraft.

The initial problem for the AAIB, was to try and identify the cause of the 'toxin' that had so debilitated the crew on the approach to Birmingham; was it CO or was it some other hazardous toxin?

Their enquiry focused upon the Auxiliary Power Unit (APU), and the various seals to protect the air supply from contamination, by fuel/oils used in the operation of aircraft.

They noted that fuel oils generally contain an additive, Tri-Cresyl Phosphate (TCP), which is known to be a neurotoxin if ingested in large quantities.

Interestingly, before any oil is approved for use in an aircraft, they observed that all oil products had to comply with the MIL-PRF- 23699 standard.

This is a standard 'owned' and created by the US Navy.

The AAIB stated that,

"However, within this specification, the US Navy does allow for some leeway in manufacturing tolerances".

They noted that the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology reported that in the absence of Tri-Ortho-Cresyl Phosphate (TOCP) confirmed poisoning cases,

"that the concerns about significant risk to the health of airline passengers and crew are not substantiated".

Carbon Monoxide Facts:

Percentage effect of CO on Human Body:

- 15 - 20% Headaches and Nausea;
- 20 - 25% Muscle Weakness, Shortness of Breath, Hyperventilation, Dizziness, Confusion and Drowsiness,
- 25 - 30% Severe Headache, Increased Fatigue, Irritability, Impaired Judgment, Possible change in the rhythm of the heart,
- 40%+ Progressively worse levels of drowsiness, Stupor, Eventual collapse and Unconsciousness,
- 60 - 70% Unconsciousness, Respiratory failure and Death

Useful Web Addresses:

<http://www.co-gassafety.co.uk/>

<http://www.aaib.dft.gov.uk/home/index.cfm>

Carbon Monoxide in the Air? (Contd)



“On behalf of Mrs X, and all air travellers, we ask why has this not taken place?”

Surely the properties of these fuels are known to suppliers, or is there a wider health and safety issue at stake; an issue which cuts to the health of every man, woman and child?”

The AAIB considered that in the case of the Birmingham flight, the most ‘probable’ cause of contamination was due to oil leakage through the APU.

This APU was later removed from the aircraft after further reports of smells and fumes were received.

The AAIB did not dismiss the notion that the crew and passengers of the Birmingham flight were not exposed to CO (they could not find CO at any appreciable level), but did concede that exposure to neurotoxins or CO could produce the same symptoms.

They concluded that research should continue, in order to identify the nature and effect of ‘toxins’ in the aircraft cabin.

However, the AAIB critically noted that the Joint Airwor-

thiness Regulations (JAR) fails; they stated,

“The regulations put the onus on the system design for clean air, with little requirement placed on the constituents of the lubricating oils so as not to be harmful to, or affect, the occupants of aircraft”.

In 2002, a Professor Nazaroff testified before the US House of Representatives, concluding that

“During abnormal operating conditions, exposure to engine oils, hydraulic fluids, and their degradation products (such as CO and Formaldehyde) might occur. No data have definitely linked exposure to these compounds with reported effects in cabin occupants”.

He also called for CO monitors to be placed in cabins and

for an enquiry into the ‘toxicity’ of the constituents of the oils or their ‘degradation products’.

On reading these reports, it appears that aircraft/airline/ petrochemical industries, not the Authorities, are in the dominant position when investigations are required.

The Authorities have clearly recommended a deeper enquiry into the ‘constituent’ fuel oil or degradation product issue.

On behalf of Mrs X, and all air travellers, we ask why has this not taken place?

Surely the properties of these fuels are known to suppliers, or is there a wider health and safety issue at stake; an issue which cuts to the health of every man, woman and child?

Significant Alterations to Essential Terms 2:

In the last edition, we briefly explored the rights that can arise for the travel consumer, when a Travel Provider makes a significant change to the ‘Package Holiday’ they have booked. We saw that an Organiser must ‘notify the consumer as quickly as possible’ where such a change is to be made. The consumer will then have the option to withdraw from the contract without penalty or to continue with the holiday. Regulation 13 of the Package Travel Regulations (PTR) sets out the extent of the rights that flow from a significant change made to their holiday contract. The Regulation states that its terms are implied into every contract, so, even if the tour

Operator does not state openly within its terms and conditions the Regulation 13 rights, they are to be read into the contract itself. If the Organiser makes a ‘significant change’ to the holiday before departure, the consumer is entitled to the following:

“To take a substitute package of equivalent or superior quality if the other party to the contract is able to offer such a substitute, or”

“To take a substitute package of a lower quality if the other party to the contract is able to offer him one and recover from the organiser the difference in price between the price of the package purchased and that of the

Substitute package, or”

“To have repaid to him as soon as possible all the monies paid by him under the contract”

In addition, the consumer can recover compensation from the Organiser for non-performance of the contract, except where the package has been cancelled because of low numbers or because it has been cancelled because of unusual or unforeseen circumstances. Note however, over-booking does not prevent a consumer from seeking compensation! These are considerable rights, and should be used by consumers to good effect - do not be put off by lame excuses!

Destroyed, Lost & Delayed Baggage Rights—Montreal Convention:



In a recent survey by the Air Transport Users Council (AUC), it was revealed that British Airways had 'lost' one million bags in transit. HolidayTravelWatch receives regular reports from travel consumers who are faced with the difficulty of being without their possessions when they arrive at their destinations. Most experience many days of delay, with little or no practical assistance provided by the airlines. Despite the survey, we take the view that there is no one airline worse than another. The air travel experience is often frustrated by poor service and inattention. Travel-

lers facing such difficulties will find their air tickets point to their rights under the Montreal Convention. This Convention supercedes the Warsaw Convention rights. Article 17 provides rights to passengers where their bags are either destroyed, lost or damaged in flight (this applies to registered or checked bags). If the airline admits to the loss of the bags and they have not arrived within 21 days, then the passenger is entitled to enforce their rights. It should be noted that there is generally no liability for unchecked baggage (is this why some airlines now encourage bags in the cabin?). Where regis-

tered bags have been delayed, a passenger's rights exist under Article 19. Both are subject to the defence that they took all necessary measures to prevent the destruction, loss or delay. Where the bags have been destroyed or lost, you have to make a written complaint to the carrier within 7 days from receipt of the bags, (this attracts compensation of 1000 Special Drawing Rights subject to a higher level declared by the passenger). Where they have been delayed, complain within 21 days from the date they were put at your disposal, (this attracts compensation of 4150 Special Drawing Rights).

“They argue that British Tour Operators are failing to ensure that infrastructures are capable of coping with an increased tourist trade, or that workers are not given sufficient rights”

How Ethical is Your Travel?

Tourism Concern has recently criticised the Travel Industry for failing to live up to the goal of Ethical Travel. They believe that very few tour operators actually deal with the fundamental issues of how travel affects a local economy, particularly where the government of that country is either unable or unwilling to create the right conditions for trade. Tourism Concern consider that Tour Operators should place themselves at the vanguard of creating a better and fairer trading condition. They argue that British Tour Operators are failing to ensure that infrastructures are capable of coping with an in-

creased tourist trade, or that workers are not given sufficient rights. Despite their 'contribution' to the environmental debate, their failures on wider ethical issues fall short of the ethic of Corporate Responsibility. We have advocated that holidaymakers are not immune from this debate. The Holidaymakers Travel Responsibility (HTR) extends itself from the first moment a consumer considers their travel plans. Which country should they visit, what is their political and social record, how has the tourist trade impacted on the economy, what are the rights of workers employed to pro-

vide services at a hotel, how does the facilities I intend to stay at impact with the local water and power supply, does the airline or cruise line I intend to travel with employ a safe record, do they provide fuel efficient means of transport, does the tour operator I intend to contract with pursue these questions and how do they develop their own trading position, do they provide a fair rate of pay for the service you are going to receive, how can I reduce my carbon footprint? These are just some of the initial questions today's traveller should ask. In the next few editions we shall explore the answers.

The next issue of 'Get'away' - Your Route to Travel Rights - will be published on 10 July 2007.

In the next edition read about:

- We again review holidaymakers experiences in the Small Claims Court
- We examine rights for delay under the Montreal Convention
- We report on the current enquiry into the sale of travel insurance
- We feature an article from Consumer Safety International (delayed from an earlier issue)
- Latest update on the threat to the Package Travel Regulations, and further developments since the Court of Appeal decision
- Plus many more features

If you do not want to receive a further copy, then please unsubscribe through the e mail in which you received this copy, and you will be permanently removed from our mailing list. If you encounter continuing unwanted receipt, then please contact us through our website, we shall ensure that you are removed from our mailing list:

www.holidaytravelwatch.com

Current 'Calls to Arms':

Regular visitors to HolidayTravelWatch will be aware that we advise when we have received reports of illness, injury or other contractual problems, either within hotels, on airlines or within cruise ships. Our 'Calls to Arms' are an indication that holidaymakers are not alone, and they may, through our service, discover a range of options to try and resolve their travel dispute. Currently we are dealing with a wide range of complaints. The most serious are the complaints received of illness on board the Nephtis Oberoi (Nile Cruise), MS Braemar (Caribbean) and MV Van Gogh. We have also received illness reports from holidaymakers who stayed at the Duke of Gordon (Scotland), Hotel Calimera Royal Moderna (Egypt). We are also continuing to deal with serious flight delay scenarios with several Charter Airlines. There are also a growing number of complaints regarding price changes, changes of holidays and poor service from DIY Operators. If you, or anyone else you know, have been affected by any of these issues please call our helpline - 01217478100 - or contact us through www.holidaytravelwatch.com On no account accept any offer to settle your claim without seeking independent advices

HolidayTravelWatch PTR Tip:

Regulation 24 of The Package Travel Regulations provides a Tour Organiser with a 'Due Diligence Defence'. Where the Organiser commits an offence under Regulation 5 (Requirement as to Brochures), Regulation 7 (Information to be provided before the contract), Regulation 8 (Information to be provided in good time), Regulation 16 (Security in the event of Insolvency), Regulation 22 (Monies in Trust), then it is a defence for an Organiser to show that 'he took all reasonable steps exercised all due diligence to avoid committing the offence'. This defence will usually involve an 'act or the default of another' or the act occurred because of 'reliance on information given by another'. The Organiser cannot rely on the defence unless they receive the leave of the court or they have served a notice on the Claimant, seven clear days before a hearing. The notice shall give information identifying the person who committed the act or the default. Where the Organiser acted on information given by another, they will not be allowed to use the defence unless they can prove it was reasonable to do so, proving the steps they took to verify the information, or whether they had any reason to disbelieve the information.

About HolidayTravelWatch:

HolidayTravelWatch was formed from the 'Holiday from Hell' experience of our Founder, Brenda Wall. She and her Husband experienced appalling conditions and several notifiable diseases. She led the first group action under the then fledgling Package Travel Regulations, and won in an out of court settlement. She then formed HolidayTravelWatch, and 11 years later, it remains the foremost consumer travel advice organisation in the UK. HolidayTravelWatch has advised over 130,000 people and guided 43.5% toward resolving their own claims; the remainder have gone onto win substantial damages. HolidayTravelWatch remains at the forefront of campaigning for safer travel and improved consumer rights protection, and frequently provides advices through media sources. The services of HolidayTravelWatch remain free to the travel consumer.

HolidayTravelWatch Legal Notice:

Please note, 'Get'away' - Your Route to Travel Rights - is a trademark of HolidayTravelWatch. 'Get'away' is a free Travel-Zine and may not be sold in full or in part. It is a condition of use of this Travel-Zine or the services of HolidayTravelWatch that no reliance on the information stated therein can be made. HolidayTravelWatch makes reasonable endeavours to ensure that all the information provided therein is accurate but cannot be held responsible for any changes made by third parties. Advice has its limitations and cannot take into account the particular circumstances of each individual or group traveller. Any information contained therein is collated, analysed and summarised; and is believed to be correct at the time of publication. Advice offered therein is not intended to be a substitute for skilled practical, travel, medical or legal advices. You should not make a complete or partial reliance on the information provided therein as it is subject to change, alteration often due to events beyond the control of HolidayTravelWatch. HolidayTravelWatch therefore recommends that all information contained therein be checked through other resources or other skilled practitioners before or after any travel arrangements made. HolidayTravelWatch will not accept any responsibility or liability, either express or implied, for any failures in any travel arrangements or contract where reliance, either complete or partial, is made upon the information contained within this Travel-Zine or through the services of HolidayTravelWatch. All material in this Travel-Zine whether written or image based is copyrighted and remains the property of HolidayTravelWatch and must not be reproduced, circulated, transmitted, sold, copied onto any forum or in any other form, in whole or in part, without the express written permission from HolidayTravelWatch - Note that permission is extended on the use of the materials in this Travel-Zine to private individuals seeking advices from HolidayTravelWatch in order to resolve their holiday complaints with tour operators or travel providers through their use of this Travel-Zine, this does not however extend to any image based material on this Travel-Zine. Please note trademarked items are or will be subject to the process of registration, all trademarked items within this Travel-Zine remain the property of HolidayTravelWatch. The views expressed within are solely the views of HolidayTravelWatch except the views expressed in guest articles which are the views of that Organisation or Author. **Note that any infringement of the copyright or trademarks of HolidayTravelWatch will result in the enforcement of those rights.**